

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 19 and 20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4 are amended. (See the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0058] and [0059].) Claim 10 is canceled. Claims 11-18 are withdrawn in response to the July 4, 2004, Restriction Requirement. New claims 19 and 20 are added. (See the specification at, for example, Fig. 1C, and paragraphs 0091 and 0093.) The specification is amended to make explicit what is implicit in paragraphs 0091 and 0093. No new matter is added.

Applicant thanks Examiner Wojciechowicz for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative, Mr. Luo, during the November 23, 2004 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 10.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,314,834 to Mazure et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Mazure discloses all elements recited in claims 1-4 and 6. Applicant respectfully submits that Mazure does not disclose or suggest a gate insulating film that includes a first layer and a second layer provided on the first layer, at least a part of the gate insulating film overlapping with a boundary region of the channel formation region adjacent to the drain region, including both of the first and second layers, is thicker than a part of the gate insulating film overlapping with a center part of the channel formation region which includes either of the first or the second layer, as recited in claim 1.

Mazure discloses forming a two-level gate dielectric stack having a thicker portion 24 and a thinner portion 14. See Figs. 1C and 4, col. 3, lines 46-57, and col. 5, lines 30-38 and lines 57-66. As shown in Figs. 1C and 4, the thicker part 24 and the thinner part 14 form a single dielectric layer. Mazure does not disclose or suggest a gate insulating film including a

first layer and a second layer provided on the first layer. Mazure does not disclose or suggest a part of the gate insulating film including both of the first and second layers, and another part of the gate insulating film including either of the first or the second layer. Therefore, Mazure does not disclose or suggest a gate insulating film including a first layer and a second layer provided on the first layer, at least a part of the gate insulating film overlapping with a boundary region of the channel formation region adjacent to the drain region, including both of the first and second layers and being thicker than a part of the gate insulating film overlapping with a center part of the channel formation region which includes either of the first or the second layer, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Mazure does not disclose each and every element recited in claim 1. Thus, Mazure does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 1, and claims 2-4 and 6 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mazure in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0025444 to Seo et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Seo discloses forming an FET on a surface film that is applicable to LCDs. See Fig. 2A and paragraphs [0005] and [0009]. Seo does not disclose or suggest a gate insulating film including a first layer and a second layer provided on the first layer, at least a part of the gate insulating film including both of the first and second layers and being thicker than a part of the gate insulating film which includes either of the first or the second layer, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Seo does not supply the subject matter lacking in Mazure.

For at least the above reasons, Mazure and Seo, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 1, or claims 5 and 7-9 depending

therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

New claims 19 and 20 are believed to be patentable at least in view of the patentability of claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for the additional features they recite. For example, Mazure and Seo do not disclose or suggest a gate insulating film including a first layer and a second layer provided on the first layer, as discussed above in connection with claim 1, and a part of the gate insulating film overlapping with a center part of the channel formation region including the second layer without including the first layer, as recited in claim 19. Also, Mazure and Seo do not disclose or suggest the first layer being one of a silicon oxide film and a silicon nitride film, the second layer being the other of the silicon oxide film and the silicon nitride film, as recited in claim 20.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9, 19 and 20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/sqb

Date: November 24, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--